



Deval L. Patrick  
Governor

# *The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

## *Department of Public Safety*

*One Ashburton Place, Room 1301  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1618*

*Phone (617) 727-3200*

*Fax (617) 727-5732*

*TTY (617) 727-0019*

[www.mass.gov/dps](http://www.mass.gov/dps)

Andrea J. Cabral  
Secretary

Thomas G. Gatzunis, P.E.  
Commissioner

### **Minutes**

#### **Board of Building Regulations and Standards Fire Prevention Fire Protection (FPFP) Advisory Committee Meeting Rooms, Department of Fire Services, Stow, MA March 18, 2014, 9:00 a.m.**

##### 1. Roll Call

- |                                     |                    |  |                    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| a. Robert Carasitti Chair (RC)      | ✓ present € absent | g. Chief Gary McCarraher (GM)            | ✓ present € absent |
| b. Dave LeBlanc V-Chair (DL)        | ✓ present € absent | h. Boston Fire Commissioner              | ✓ present € absent |
| c. Walter Adams (WA)                | ✓ present € absent | Paul Donga (PD) served as designee       |                    |
| d. Don Contois (DC)                 | ✓ present € absent | i. State Fire Marshal                    | ✓ present € absent |
| e. Harold Cutler (HL)               | ✓ present € absent | Jake Nunnemacher (JN) served as designee |                    |
| f. Rob Anderson (or designee)       | ✓ present € absent | j. Kurt Ruchala (KR)                     | ✓ present € absent |
| Mike Guigli (MG) served as designee |                    | k. Louise Vera (LV)                      | ✓ present € absent |

General note on format: votes are noted as (Motion by, Second by, All) if the vote is unanimous followed by the time.

2. Relative to previous meeting minutes the Chairman noted that the last FPFP was approximately 6 months prior. He would review for past minutes and report back to the Committee at the next meeting.
3. The committee reviewed smoke detection requirements for common areas of multi-unit residential buildings.

Several members noted that in previous editions of 780 CMR, common area smoke detection was always required in multi-unit residential buildings. And, for pre 1975 residential buildings, 527 CMR has criteria for common area smoke detection requirements.

It was not until the 8<sup>th</sup> Edition with the adoption of the virgin 2009 IBC criteria that smoke detection in common areas was removed for the model code for R-2 uses. The model code removal of the requirement was predicated on the new construction criteria that all R-2 Uses were required to be protected throughout with sprinklers. It was also noted that the model code was reintroducing the requirement for common area smoke detection in certain R-2 uses (but not all) in future editions including the 2015 which is intended to be the basis for the 9<sup>th</sup> Edition of 780 CMR.

Based on the discussion, it was concluded that the issue is more concerning for existing residential uses where sprinklers may not be provided or the building may not be as well protected with features as intended for new construction. It was noted that unless full compliance with new construction criteria can be demonstrated, the criteria for common area smoke detection was still required for existing buildings by the codes in effect at the time of construction or 527 CMR. MG made a motion to develop an official interpretation on the application of common area smoke detection requirements for existing buildings. HC seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Next steps include develop of a draft official interpretation in conjunction with the Chapter 34 Committee input.

4. The committee reviewed of wireless smoke detection/fire alarm requirements per questions posed by DFS.

The discussion centered around three specific considerations:

1. The reliability of the wireless “Interconnection”
2. The reliability of the wireless “monitoring”
3. The issue with the requirement for primary power to be hardwired for specific cases.

It was noted that the national standards address the wireless technology in a limited manner and not to the extent of the issues identified above. While there was acknowledgement of certain systems demonstrating reliability because they are monitored by monitoring agents, there were questions regarding newer stand-alone systems without such monitoring. After some more discussion, the chair requested members to consider the matter further and the discussion would be revisited at the next meeting.

5. The Committee reviewed the March 11 version of BBRS white paper on the cost and effectiveness of fire protection systems in 3 to 6 unit residential buildings.

MG presented on the topic giving background on the purposes and intent of the effort. The basic question that was being asked was “Are existing R uses being sprinklered at the same rate under the 8th Edition as under previous editions?”

TR noted that the BBRS charged FFPF with maintaining the same level of safety as in the 7th Edition. MG acknowledged that was the original charge and that since then there has been a Model 15 effort and there continues to be reviews of the state building code, and other laws, relating to cost impact of requirements. This white paper is intended to be the “next step”. He also noted that cost effectiveness is a consideration specifically called for within the enabling legislation and executive order. TR noted that both “cost and effectiveness” are called for within the language.

It is noted, that approximately 15 minutes into the presentation, the State Fire Marshal designee changed as Jake Nunnemacher withdrew and Tim Rodrique replaced him.

MG then continued by reviewing the major elements of the paper and responded to several member questions during the presentation, including several on specific data information in the report. Several members, including the chair, noted they needed more time to consider the information. The matter was left for members to consider further and the discussion to resume at the next FFPF meeting.

6. Other matters not reasonably anticipated 2 business days in advance of meeting.

6.a. JN brought to the Committee’s attention that while the last 780 CMR code change adopted the 2010 NFPA 72 for the commercial code, a similar adoption was not made for Chapter 51, the One and Two Family code. It was noted that a code change proposal to coordinate the requirements to the same 2010 Edition of NFPA 72 was needed for Chapter 51.

6.b. MG reviewed the issue of “Remote Participation” under the open meeting laws. He noted several conditions including Pre-Notice, No Quorum by Phone, No remote Vote, etc. After a brief discussion, a motion was made by MG that FFPF not utilize “remote participation” as a matter of internal policy. The motion was seconded by GM. A brief discussion noted the Committee could always revisit the policy. The vote was unanimous.

7. A motion was made by DL to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by MG. The vote was unanimous.